



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,066	04/21/2004	Frank Gong	SBL01741	5955
22917	7590	06/25/2009	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA, INC.			AU, GARY	
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD			ART UNIT	
IL01/3RD			PAPER NUMBER	
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			2617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/25/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docketing.US@motorola.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/829,066	Applicant(s) GONG ET AL.	
	Examiner Gary Au	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14, 16-21, 23 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14, 16-21, 23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/17/2009 and 4/29/2009</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/21/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-21, 23 and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 11, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,115,616 Halperin et al.

Art Unit: 2617

(Halperin) and further in view of US Patent No. 7,042,334 Mosgrove et al. (Mosgrove) and US Patent Publication No. 2004/0217939 Levy et al. (Levy).

Art Unit: 2617

As to claim 1, Halperin teaches a key pad assembly (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41) comprising: a top cover placed over a stack of keypad components (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41); a bottom cover placed under the stack defining a common perimeter (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41); the top cover and the bottom cover to form a self contained key pad unit (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41). However, Halperin fails to teach an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit.

In an analogous art, Mosgrove teaches an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit (col. 6 line 65 – col. 7 line 3 and col. 7 line 60 – col. 8 line 7).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Halperin's system to include an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit, as taught by Mosgrove, for the advantage of activating the particular user in accordance with the user's predetermined privileges from the record (col. 7 line 60 – col. 8 line 7).

However, the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove fails to disclose an over molded portion.

In an analogous art, Levy teaches an over molded portion ([0067], [0070] and [0077]).

Art Unit: 2617

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove to include an over molded portion, as taught by Levy, for the advantage of fitting in different devices.

As to claim 11, Halperin teaches a method of fabricating a self contained key pad (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41) comprising: sandwiching a plurality of key pad components between a top cover and a bottom cover, the top cover and bottom cover defining a common perimeter (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41). However, Halperin fails to teach an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit.

In an analogous art, Mosgrove teaches an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit (col. 6 line 65 – col. 7 line 3 and col. 7 line 60 – col. 8 line 7).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Halperin's system to include an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit, as taught by Mosgrove, for the advantage of activating the particular user in accordance with the user's predetermined privileges from the record (col. 7 line 60 – col. 8 line 7).

However, the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove fails to disclose an over molded portion.

In an analogous art, Levy teaches an over molded portion ([0067], [0070] and [0077]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove to include an over molded portion, as taught by Levy, for the advantage of fitting in different devices.

As to claim 16, Halperin teaches a self contained key pad (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41) comprising: a stack (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41) comprising: inherently teaches a membrane with a placed thereupon, a printed circuit board positioned beneath the membrane (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41, the keyboard assembly has to have a membrane and a printed circuit board); a top cover placed over the stack (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41); a bottom cover placed under the stack (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41), the top cover and the bottom cover define a common boundary around the stack (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41). However, Halperin fails to teach an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit.

In an analogous art, Mosgrove teaches an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit (col. 6 line 65 – col. 7 line 3 and col. 7 line 60 – col. 8 line 7).

Art Unit: 2617

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Halperin's system to include an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit, as taught by Mosgrove, for the advantage of activating the particular user in accordance with the user's predetermined privileges from the record (col. 7 line 60 – col. 8 line 7).

However, the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove fails to disclose an over molded portion.

In an analogous art, Levy teaches an over molded portion ([0067], [0070] and [0077]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove to include an over molded portion, as taught by Levy, for the advantage of fitting in different devices.

As to claims 2, 12 and 21, Halperin teaches the top cover and the bottom sandwich the stack (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41).

As to claims 3, 17 and 18, Halperin teaches the top cover and the bottom cover are over molded to create a sealed common boundary (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41).

Art Unit: 2617

As to claims 5 and 14, Halperin teaches the flex member provides an electrical connection between the self contained key pad unit and a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41).

As to claim 20, Halperin inherently teaches the bottom cover contacts the printed circuit board (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41).

As to claims 23 and 24, Halperin teaches the system as described above. However, Halperin fails to teach an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit.

In an analogous art, Mosgrove teaches an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit (col. 6 line 65 – col. 7 line 3 and col. 7 line 60 – col. 8 line 7).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Halperin's system to include an identification component that automatically identifies the key pad to a device that hosts the self contained key pad unit, as taught by Mosgrove, for the advantage of activating the particular user in accordance with the user's predetermined privileges from the record (col. 7 line 60 – col. 8 line 7).

5. Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,115,616 Halperin et al. (Halperin), US Patent No. 7,042,334 Mosgrove

Art Unit: 2617

et al. (Mosgrove) and US Patent Publication No. 2004/0217939 Levy et al. (Levy) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,950,680 Kela et al. (Kela).

Considering claim 4, Halperin inherently teaches a printed circuit board and a silicone membrane with a plurality of keys (keyboard card 16 – figure 1, col. 2 lines 35-41, the keyboard assembly has to have a membrane and a printed circuit board). However, the combined system is silent about the stack comprises an electro luminous panel, placed on top of each other.

In an analogous art, Kela teaches the stack comprises an electro luminous panel (28 - figure 3, col. 4 lines 10-33), placed on top of each other (figure 4, col. 3 line 63 – col. 4 line 9).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove to include the stack comprises an electro luminous panel, placed on top of each other, as taught by Kela, for the advantage of assembling a keyboard.

Considering claim 10, the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove teaches the system as described above. However, the combined system fails to teach an illumination color or a brightness on a surface of the keypad indicates a mode of the key pad.

In an analogous art, Kela teaches an illumination color or a brightness on a surface of the keypad indicates a mode of the key pad (col. 1 lines 19-35).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove to include an illumination color or a brightness on a surface of the keypad indicates a mode of the key pad, as taught by Kela, for the advantage of notifying the user of the mode of the mobile phone.

6. Claims 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,115,616 Halperin et al. (Halperin), US Patent No. 7,042,334 Mosgrove et al. (Mosgrove) and US Patent Publication No. 2004/0217939 Levy et al. (Levy) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent Application No. 2004/0110529 Watanabe et al. (Watanabe).

Considering claims 8 and 13, the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove teaches the system as described above. However, the combined system fails to teach the bottom cover with a recess that houses a speaker therein.

In an analogous art, Watanabe teaches the bottom cover with a recess that houses a speaker therein (figure 1B and 1C, [0049]).

Art Unit: 2617

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove to include the bottom cover with a recess that houses a speaker therein, as taught by Watanabe, for the advantage of assembling a key pad unit.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,115,616 Halperin et al. (Halperin), US Patent No. 7,042,334 Mosgrove et al. (Mosgrove) and US Patent Publication No. 2004/0217939 Levy et al. (Levy) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,841,857 Zoiss et al. (Zoiss).

Considering claim 7, the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove teaches the key pad assembly of claim 1 as described above, but fails to disclose a trough.

In an analogous art, Zoiss teaches a trough (col. 4 lines 38-67, col. 5 lines 41-51 and col. 7 lines 37-47).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove to include a trough, as taught by Zoiss, for the advantage of forming the desiccant-retaining section of the carrier (col. 4 lines 38-53).

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,115,616 Halperin et al. (Halperin), US Patent No. 7,042,334 Mosgrove et al. (Mosgrove) and US Patent Publication No. 2004/0217939 Levy et al. (Levy) as

Art Unit: 2617

applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,517,683 Collett et al. (Collett).

Considering claim 9, the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove teaches the key pad assembly of claim 1, but fails to disclose the top cover and bottom cover fabricated from one of polycarbonates, thermoset plastics, and thermoformed plastic.

In an analogous art, Collett teaches the top cover and bottom cover fabricated from polycarbonates (col. 6 lines 17-32).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Halperin and Mosgrove to include the top cover and bottom cover fabricated from polycarbonates, as taught by Collett, for the advantage of higher impact resistance (col. 6 lines 17-32).

9. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,115,616 Halperin et al. (Halperin), US Patent No. 7,042,334 Mosgrove et al. (Mosgrove), US Patent Publication No. 2004/0217939 Levy et al. (Levy) and US Patent No. 6,950,680 Kela et al. (Kela) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of US Patent no. 6,785,395 Arneson et al. (Arneson).

As to claim 19, the combined system of Halperin, Mosgrove and Kela teaches the system as described above. However, the combined system fails to teach the speaker is a piezo electric speaker.

In an analogous art, Arneson teaches the speaker is a piezo electric speaker (col. 5 lines 29-46).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Halperin, Mosgrove and Kela to include a piezo electric speaker, as taught by Arneson, for the advantage of a high free-air resonant frequency (col. 1 lines 40-52).

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Au whose telephone number is (571) 272-2822. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent P. Harper can be reached on (571) 272-7605. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/829,066
Art Unit: 2617

Page 14

/VINCENT P. HARPER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Gary Au/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617